



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_47410
Title of the Manuscript:	THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRUNK LEG RATIO AND PEAK EXPIRATORY FLOW RATE IN 200 LEVEL MBBS/BDS STUDENTS OF BAYERO UNIVERSITY KANO.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Title: need a revision.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Too long, should limit according to standard. 2. Background is too long. Objective of study was not mentioned clearly. 3. Analysis should be done by gender. 4. Conclusion may differ once objective is clearly stated and further analysis. <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some paragraph is not relevant to the study. Significant of the study must be mentioned clearly. <p>Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information such as selection criteria, ethics approval and anthropometric measures were not presented. <p>Results and discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis for between gender should be done, therefore results and discussion should be more relevant. 2. Overall discussion is not in depth, too general and some are not related. <p>Limitations of the study: please highlight this</p> <p>Conclusion and recommendation: Please re do according to gender differences.</p> <p>General comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please see attachment for detailed comments. 2. Please check typo errors as indicated in the attachment. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>This article has no evidence that ethics approval has been obtained, since sample are human subjects, therefore it is necessary to obtain one.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria Justine @ Stephany
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA , Malaysia